



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,785	04/27/2001	Helen Elizabeth Bryan	1585-273	7329

7590 03/16/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Rd.
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

GRAYSAY, TAMARA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/842,785	BRYAN ET AL.
	Examiner Tamara L. Graysay	Art Unit 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "step 6" (Fig.7).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 14, lines 16-17, reference character "26" should be --18-- as depicted in Figure 4 and as mentioned at page 11, lines 5 and 14.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3623

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 12, the limitation “the nuclear fuel rods” in the claim lacks antecedent basis. For purposes of this Office action, claim 12 has been treated as though it depends upon claim 11, rather than claim 10, just as claim 3 depends upon claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 10-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loftus (US-4740349) in view of Tech-Con Twenty Five (cited by applicant, Feb 2000 Presentation to Customers).

Regarding claims 1-5 and 7-9, Loftus discloses a host computer (C.16, L.30-53) in communication with other computer systems, operating an interactive information management program (software) having graphical image (display monitor screen); a first and second database linked together via the program (C.11-13); and a user terminal for displaying the image and causing retrieval of information corresponding to a feature of the nuclear plant (181, 187, 191, 193, 193). Loftus discloses video image of the fuel rod replacement and assembly process (surveillance of manufacturing floor and training center).

Loftus lacks a terminal wherein a user can point to a feature to retrieve information from the tables (databases).

Tech-Con Twenty Five shows, on several pages, a grid from which fuel rods in a reactor can be selected in order to graphically or visually simplify retrieval of information about the fuel cell and/or reactor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loftus to include a point and select feature, such as suggested by Tech-Con Twenty Five, in order to simplify retrieval and review of information about a fuel cell and/or reactor.

Further regarding claims 1-5 and 7-9, the preamble limitation “to conduct an audit” is broad and is encompassed by the combination, which enables a user to review information contained within the database for any intended purpose of the user.

Regarding claim 10, subparagraph limitations (d and e) are not recited in terms of the steps that are being performed in the method of providing remote access, i.e., they lack terms having an “-ing” suffix, so they have been treated as though they are part of the selecting limitation that retrieves and displays data on the remote terminal.

Further regarding claims 10-14 and 16-18, the steps of operating a graphical program; accessing information remotely (for example, computer 191 in other department location); and selecting a feature displayed on the image are shown in the Loftus and Tech-Con Twenty Five combination. In particular the Tech-Con Twenty Five reference shows display features that can be selected to view video images of various areas of the nuclear plant, including manufacturing and training.

5. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Loftus (US-4740349) and Tech-Con Twenty Five (cited by applicant, Feb 2000 Presentation to Customers) combination, as applied to claims 1 and 10, above, and further in view of Chang (JP-11085890-A).

Chang teaches the use of a security program, including passwords, encryption keys, and audit trails for accessing specific information contained in a computer database in order to make communications safe between a user and the computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Loftus and Tech-Con Twenty Five combination to include a security program that limits access to information, such as taught by Chang, for accessing specific information contained in the computer database in order to make communications safe between a user and the computer system.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Doi (JP-05282251-A) teaches an image display for an item that is monitored.
- Ando (JP-05217091-A) teaches remote access to and display of images stored in a host computer. The remote access is made via a field computer at a plant.
- Cantineau (EP-0981100-A1) teaches electronic linking of documents for a nuclear power plant.

Art Unit: 3623

- Petke (WO-99/30265-A1) and Wiitala (WO-99/42940-A1) teach systems, methods, and computer programs for ensuring compliance with government regulations in the field of government-regulated manufacturing, e.g., chemical products.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamara L. Graysay whose telephone number is (703) 305-1918. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tamara L. Graysay
Examiner
Art Unit 3623

03112005